

REMARKS

Claims 1-6, 10, 11, 14-19, 23, 24, 27-32, 36, 37, 40-46, 48, 49, and 51 were pending in this application.

Claims 1-6, 10, 11, 14-19, 23, 24, 27-32, 36, 37, and 40-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Emens et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,591,279 ("Emens"), in view of Serbinis et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,584,466 ("Serbinis"), in further view of Davis et al. U.S. Patent No. 7,010,144 ("Davis").

Claims 46-49 and 51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Emens in view of Serbinis and in further view of Major et al. U.S. Patent No. 7,209,955 ("Major") and Davis.

The Examiner's rejections are respectfully traversed.

Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 14, 27, 40, and 46 to more particularly define the invention. No new matter has been added by the amendments and the amendments are fully supported by the original specification.

The Rejection of Independent Claim 1, 14, and 27

The Examiner rejected independent claims 1, 14, and 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Emens in view of Serbinis in further view of Davis.

Applicants' amended independent claims 1, 14, and 27 are, generally speaking, directed to a method and systems for providing remote access to a capture device and content captured by the capture device. Content regarding an event (e.g., detected by a sensor) is captured by the capture device and encapsulated with metadata that includes information about the

capture device, the content, the event, and user information. The content encapsulated with metadata is transmitted to a remote computer over a communications network, where the metadata encapsulating the content is processed according the information included in the metadata. The processing includes automatically associating the content with a user account, publishing the content to a database on the remote computer, generating a textual notification at the remote computer that includes information about the event, and transmitting the textual notification from the remote computer to a user associated with the account. The user may access the published content and current status information for the capture device using a user access device and the user may send a command from the user access device to the capture device via the remote computer.

Emens refers to a computer-based notification system. A user may define an event notification profile such that, when a sensor receives an indication that corresponds to those of the notification profile, a notification, including a digital image of the event, is sent to the user in an email. The user cannot access a remote computer via a user access device to access current status information for the capture device or to send a command to the capture device.

Serbinis refers to an Internet-based document management system. An electronic document may be stored on an Internet-accessible server and accessed using a web browser, downloaded for review or manipulation, and then returned to the server for access by other users. The document management system may send authorized users notifications related to the documents stored on the server.

Davis refers to a steganographic embedder that associates metadata with an image.

The combination of Emens, Serbinis, and Davis does not show or suggest all of the elements of applicants' amended independent claims. In particular, the combination of these references does not show or suggest "allowing the user to [1] access . . . current status information for the capture device on the remote computer with a user access device and [2] send a command from the user access device to the capture device via the remote computer." There is nothing in Emens that shows or suggests these features. The system in Emens merely refers to sending notifications to a user based on real-world events. Emens does not show or suggest allowing a user to access current status information for or send a command to a capture device as required by applicants' claims. Serbinis and Davis also do not show this feature.

For at least this reason, applicants submit that the rejection of amended independent claims 1, 14, and 27 should be withdrawn.

#### The Rejection of Independent Claims 40 and 46

The Examiner rejected independent claim 40 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Emens in view of Serbinis in further view of Davis. The Examiner rejected independent claim 46 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Emens in view of Serbinis in further view of Davis and Major.

Applicants submit that the rejections of amended independent claims 40 and 46 should be withdrawn for at least

the reasons recited above with respect to amended independent claims 1, 14, and 27.

The Rejection of the Dependent Claims

Applicants submit that the dependent claims 2-6, 10, 11, 15-19, 23, 24, 28-32, 36, 37, 41-45, 48, 49, and 51 are allowable at least because they depend, directly or indirectly from independent claims 1, 14, 27, 40, and 46, respectively.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, applicants submit that this application, including claims 1-6, 10, 11, 14-19, 23, 24, 27-32, 36, 37, 40-46, 48, 49, and 51, is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/Michael J. Chasan/  
Michael J. Chasan  
Registration No. 54,026  
Agent for Applicants

ROPPES & GRAY LLP  
Customer No. 1473  
1211 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, New York 10036  
Tel.: (212) 596-9000  
Fax: (212) 596-9090